## 

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,	) Case No. CR 17 - 284 WHA
Plaintiff, v.	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
BEL ALARCON	May 2/20
Defendant.	( CAN DISTRICTION OF THE COLOR
Speedy Trial Act from	to, 2015, the Court excludes time under the to, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):
Failure to grant a continuance See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)	would be likely to result in a miscarriage of justice. (i).
defendants, the nature of law, that it is unreasonable to	omplex, due to [check applicable reasons] the number of of the prosecution, or the existence of novel questions of fact to expect adequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial cablished by this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	would deny the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, se of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
	would unreasonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given commitments, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. (iv).
<del></del>	would unreasonably deny the defendant the reasonable time ation, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED.	1. (4)
DATED: $\sqrt{27}$	JACQUELINE SCOTT CORLEY United States Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Juhn hulf. 1 Attorney for Defenda	ant Milchell Assistant Uthited States Actionney